

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-16, 41 and 42 are in the application. Claims 17-40 and 43-48 are canceled as directed to non-elected inventions. No claim is allowed.

Claims 1, 15, 16, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cole et al. (US 2004/0137978) in view of Atwater et al. ("Atwater." US 2001/0010689, newly cited). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to dependent Claims 15, 16, and 42, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. If the independent claim is allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The examiner cites Par. [0119] and [0120] in Cole. In Par. [0119], it is disclosed that game station **20** may comprise two separate units and that the second unit may be linked to the first with a wireless connection permitting transfer of credit information. But it is not shown that the gaming units may be wirelessly linked to peripheral devices. Par. [0119] discloses the transmittal of only credit information between machines. That is not the same as managing and configuring peripherals to a gaming machine. Par. [0120] discloses that two games (not the gaming machines per se) may be linked to a single coupon reader, either through a single master controller, or through separate gaming controllers. This does not show that a gaming controller in a gaming machine necessarily wirelessly manages and configures the coupon reader. In view of the teachings of Par. [0119], if there is any wireless communication, it is only to transmit credit information between gaming machines.

Cole can only manage the peripherals using the master gaming controller 101 (FIG. 6) in the configuration for which the system is wired. Configuration or reconfiguration of the peripheral controller by a communication manager is not addressed in Cole.

Atwater does not address the configuration or reconfiguration of a peripheral controller. In [0008] it teaches replacing wires with a short range radio link but this is related to connecting an external peripheral to a mother device.

In [0095] a single chip embodiment is described which is allegedly designed to implement communication of a CPU to peripherals using a designated IEEE transmission band and a Bluetooth band such that when transmission in one band occurs the other band is disabled. This does not show that there is a communication manager that is adapted to configure a

peripheral controller (618, 620) to communicate wirelessly with a master controller or two or more peripherals to communicate wirelessly with one another. The only wireless communication is between the chip 600 and peripherals. Accordingly, it is submitted that Atwater does not teach wireless communication internally among controllers. Thus it is submitted that the claims are not obvious over the combination of Cole and Atwater and withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 3-14 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cole and Atwater in view of Lazzarotto et al (US 6,782,194(stet): US 6,782,245). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 3-14 and 41 depend from Claim 1. Thus, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The reliance on Lazzarotto does not remedy the deficiencies of Cole. Furthermore, Lazzarotto (3:17-31) does not disclose a wireless communication manager adapted to configure a peripheral controller by assigning a communication identification key to the peripheral device. The cited passage relates to decoding an incoming data signal from a peripheral and to determine if it is valid (i.e. no errors; see 6:48-54) and if it is compatible with the current USB format in use. Thus the features of claim 3, now incorporated into claim 1, are not taught. Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the combination of Cole and Lazzarotto does not form a *prima facie* case, and withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

It is submitted that this amendment places the above-identified patent application in condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time that may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in

connection with the filing of this amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480  
(Order No. IGT1P060X2).

Respectfully submitted,  
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP  
/Reginald J. Suyat/  
Reginald J. Suyat  
Reg. No. 28,172

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100